UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/963,812	09/26/2001	Jorg Gregor Schleicher	1104-032	1207

27820 7590 02/04/2008

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.
100 REGENCY FOREST DRIVE
SUITE 160
CARY, NC 27518

EXAMINER	
JABR, FADEY S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
02/04/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/963,812	SCHLEICHER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	FADEY S. JABR	3628	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *27 December 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims **1-29** remain pending and are again presented for examination.

Response to Arguments

1. Due to the New Grounds of Rejection (specifically the rejection of claims 28-29) in the Examiner's Answer mailed 30 October 2007, the finality of Final Office action, mailed 8 March 2007 is withdrawn.

2. As stated by the applicant, claims **28-29** correspond to claims **9** and **27** but without the means plus function language. The claims were inadvertently not entered after the Non-final Office action mailed 7 October 2005. Therefore, Claims **28-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ricci, Pub. No. US2002/0062290 A1 in view of Ferguson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,819,092.

3. Applicant argues that Ricci fails to disclose subscription services. Ricci discloses that collecting royalties without charging subscription fees is an alternative form of levying fees. Ricci actually discloses that the royalty may be a traditional charge (i.e. subscription fees or any other form of charging a user) (Para. 30). Examiner notes that Ricci does disclose charging a fee based on a quantity of content served, Ricci states that the royalties (fees) are based on the number of uses (quantity is equivalent to the number of uses) (Para. 53). Further, Ferguson et al. discloses paying owners of the affiliate servers. Content providers are affiliate server owners, where users can download content from the content provider node (Col. 9, lines 2-9).

4. Regarding the Applicant's argument that the Patent Office has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner asserts that the combination of references, i.e. Ricci in view of Ferguson et al., is proper. In this case, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been led to combine Ricci and Ferguson et al. in view of the fact that both references are directed to providing on-line content to users. Also, Ricci and Ferguson et al. are both related to charging users fees for downloading the content. For instance, Ricci discloses a method for distributing and licensing digital media across a network of peers (abstract). Ricci attempts to overcome the difficulties faced by content owners whose digital content was being downloaded in peer-to-peer networks without compensating the content owners by implementing a system that allows peer-to-peer file sharing while at the same time charging users for the content provided in order to compensate content owners. Ricci discloses users downloading a file will pay the appropriate royalty. Paying the appropriate royalty recoups the costs to the content provider for distributing the files, who must then compensate the content creator for use of their content. Furthermore, Ferguson et al. teaches a fee setting tool that allows the developer to develop a fee structure for an online service, e.g. downloading content (abstract). Ferguson et al. further teaches a third party content provider (i.e. content owner) can be paid when that third party content provider supplies valuable information desired by the users of the online services. The action of paying the content providers for supplying the information is in essence compensating the content providers for distributing the files. We have noted that evidence of a suggestion, teaching, or motivation to combine may flow from the prior art references themselves, the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art, or, in some cases, from the nature of the problem to be solved. *In re Dembiczak*, 50 USPQ2d 1614. Therefore, the "motivation-suggestion-teaching" test asks not

merely what the references disclose, but whether a person of ordinary skill in the art, possessed with the understandings and knowledge reflected in the prior art, and motivated by the general problem facing the inventor, would have been led to make the combination recited in the claims. *In re Kahn* 78 USPQ2d 1329 (CAFC 2006). Thus, someone of ordinary skill in the art would be led to combine Ricci and Ferguson et al.

5. Applicant argues that neither Ricci nor Ferguson et al., alone or in combination, teach or suggest the claim limitation "charging a fee based on a quantity of content served." The Applicant notes that independent claims 1, 9, 17, and 25-27, as well as claims 28 and 29, all recite "charging a fee based on a quantity of content served" or similar language. The Applicant further recites "the quantity of content corresponds to the actual amount of data being served." As an example, the Applicant's Specification provides that "a sliding-fee scale…..,e.g. $30 for 1 gigabyte…." Examiner notes that the Applicant's specification actually recites "For example, a sliding-fee scale…" It is well established that *examples* in a specification do not further define a claim limitation, and therefore the Applicant's definition for the claim limitation "charging a fee based on a quantity of content served" is not based on the example given in the specification.

Recent decisions have indicated that if an inventor is relying on a special meaning for terms appearing in the claims, then the special meaning must be clearly written in the specification. "Although an applicant may be his own lexicographer… nothing in the specification defines the phrase 'quantity of content served' differently from its ordinary meaning", see *In Re ThriftI,* 63 USPQ2d 2002, 2006 (Fed. Cir. 2002). "One purpose for examining the specification is to determine if the patentee has limited the scope of the claims.' …For example, an inventor may choose to be his own lexicographer if he defines the specific

terms used to describe the invention 'with reasonable clarity, deliberateness, and precision', see *Teleflex, Inc. v. Ficosa N. Am. Corp.,* 63 USPQ2d 1374, 1381 (Fed. Cir. 2002) and *In re Paulsen*, 31 USPQ2d 1671, 1674-75 (Fed. Cir. 1994). Examiner submits that the "number of uses" disclosed by Ricci meets the definition for "quantity of content served" described by the Applicant.

Applicant argues, "the fee in Ricci is the copyright royalty payment". Examiner asserts that a fee owed to a copyright owner wherein the user is charged based on the number of uses (e.g. downloads, duration, etc.) is equivalent to the Applicant's "quantity of content." Further, the Applicant argues that "the amount of the fee charged is not linked to the number of uses in the database." However, Examiner notes that a user purchasing a license to use the digital media would be charged based on the number of licenses that user purchases and therefore would be charged on the "quantity of content served." The Examiner notes the broadest reasonable interpretation of "number of uses" would include "quantity of content served." Further, Examiner notes during patent examination, the pending claims must be "given their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification," moreover the Examiner notes claims of issued patents are interpreted in light of the specification, but during examination, prosecution history, prior art, and other claims, must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow (MPEP 2111). Thus, the Examiner interprets Ricci to disclose quantity of content served.

Examiner notes that Applicant's argument, "Different files will often be different sizes, and Ricci makes no differentiation between files of different size", is inconsistent with the Applicant's claim limitations. Applicant is attempting to read in a definition into the claim limitations which lacks support in the specification. Further, the claim limitations are broader

than the definition that the Applicant is attempting to argue. Applicant's specification fails to define the claim limitation in a manner that one of ordinary skill in the art would read "quantity of content served" differently than the Examiner has already done.

Furthermore, Examiner notes that Ferguson et al. further teaches charging a user based on the quantity of content served. Ferguson et al. teaches, "The ability to set fees to be paid by the user *for an amount of data accessed*, the time spent "logged on" to the online service, or the purchase of particular merchandise…" Ferguson et al. thus teaches that it is old and well known in the art to charge a user based a quantity (i.e. amount) of content (data) served (accessed).

6. Applicant argues with respect to claims 3, 11, 19, 26, 27 and 29 that Ferguson et al. fails to teach paying owners of the affiliate servers a percentage of the fee charged for serving the content. However, Examiner notes that the Ferguson reference was cited for teaching charging or paying users or content providers (C. 9, lines 2-9). Ricci was cited for disclosing, "transfers of the digital media can be made on the bandwidth of the peers rather than the originator, ie. enabling client nodes to become affiliate servers that deliver content to other client nodes (0030). Ferguson et al.'s teaching of paying the content provider or user for the digital media transaction in combination with Ricci's disclosure of peer-to-peer file sharing teaches the Applicant's invention. Paying users who allow other client nodes to download files from their system is a basic economical decision wherein a resource supplier is reimbursed for their resource

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims **1-6, 9-14, 17-22 and 26-29** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ricci, Pub. No. US2002/0062290 A1 in view of Ferguson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,819,092.

As per **Claims 1, 9, 17 and 29**, Ricci discloses a method for generating revenue in a peer-to-peer file delivery network, the network including at least one server node and multiple client nodes, the method comprising the steps of:

(a) enabling peer-to-peer file sharing of content by,

- (i) initiating on one client node a download of a particular content item served from the server node or another client node (0030-0033), and
- (ii) charging a fee based on a quantity of the content served (0022, 0053); and

(b) enabling decentralized downloads of subscription-based content by

- (i) allowing the client nodes to subscribe to one or more of the subscription-based content (0057, 0061),
- (ii) periodically sending the subscribed to subscription-based content to each the respective subscribing client nodes (0040).

Nonetheless, Ricci fails to disclose charging a fee to providers of the subscription-based content for serving the subscription-based content. However, Ferguson et al. teaches levying fees on content providers for transactions with the users (C. 4, lines 53-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ricci and charge a fee to subscription-based content providers for transmitting their content as taught by Ferguson et al. because charging users and content providers a fee would greatly increase profitability of the file sharing service.

As per **Claims 2, 10, 18**, Ricci further discloses a method of providing direct marketing by sending marketing content to the client nodes from the server node as well as from other client nodes (0065, lines 1-8). Ricci fails to disclose charging a fee to providers of the marketing content. However, Ferguson et al. teaches charging a fee to providers of the marketing content (C. 14, lines 30-31). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ricci to include charging marketing content providers a fee as taught by Ferguson et al. because charging marketing content providers a fee would greatly increase profitability of the file sharing service.

As per **Claims 3, 11, and 19**, Ricci further discloses a method enabling client nodes to become affiliate servers that deliver content to other client nodes (0030). Ricci fails to disclose paying owners of the affiliate servers a percentage of the fee charged for serving the files. However, Ferguson et al. teaches paying the user of the service (C. 9, lines 2-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to

modify the method of Ricci to include paying users of the affiliate servers a portion of the fee charged for serving the files as taught by Ferguson et al. because paying owners of the affiliate servers would increase retention of the affiliate server owners.

As per **Claims 4-6, 12-14, and 20-22**, Ricci further discloses a method including the steps of charging a fee from a user of the initiating client node for the download of the fee-based content (0022, 0053). Ricci fails to disclose charging a fee from a provider of the free content for serving the free content. However, Ferguson et al. teaches charging content providers a fee (C. 4, lines 53-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ricci to include charging content providers a fee for serving the free content as taught by Ferguson et al. because charging content providers a fee would greatly increase profitability of the file sharing service.

As per **Claims 26-28**, Ricci discloses a system for generating revenue in a peer-to-peer file delivery network, the network including at least one server node and multiple client nodes, the method comprising the steps of:

- means for enabling peer-to-peer file sharing of content whereby one client node initiates a download of a particular content item served from the server node or another client node (0018), and
- wherein a fee is charged based on a quantity of the content served (0022, 0053);

- means for providing direct marketing to client nodes such that marketing content is send to the client nodes from the server node as well as from other client nodes (0065, lines 1-8),
- means for enabling client nodes to become affiliate servers that deliver content to other client nodes (0030),

Nonetheless, Ricci fails to disclose:

- means for enabling decentralized downloads of subscription-based content that the client nodes subscribe to in order to receive periodic updates, wherein a fee is charged to providers of the subscription-based content for serving the subscription-based content to the client nodes;
- owners of the affiliate servers are paid a percentage of the fee charged for serving the files.
- a fee is charged to providers of the marketing content.

However, Ferguson et al. teaches users of the system receive periodic updates; levying fees on content providers for transactions with the users; paying users of affiliate servers for serving the files, and finally teaches charging marketing content providers a fee (C. 15, lines 7-11; C. 4, lines 53-60; C. 14, lines 30-31; C. 9, lines 2-9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ricci and include providing periodic updates to users, levying fees on content providers, and to pay owners of affiliate servers for serving the files as taught by Ferguson et al. because charging content providers a fee would greatly increase profitability of the file sharing service. Also, paying

owners of affiliate servers because paying owners of the affiliate servers would increase retention of the affiliate server owners.

9. Claims **7, 8, 15, 16, 23-25** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ricci, Pub. No. US2002/0062290 A1 in view of Ferguson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,819,092 as applied to claims **1, 9, 17 and 29** above, and further in view of Applicants admission of the prior art.

As per **Claims 7, 15, and 23**, Ricci fails to disclose a method of charging a fee from the provider of the marketing content based on a cost per click. However, Applicant discloses that this feature is old and well known, see Specification, Page 11, lines 8-11. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the Ricci and include charging a fee from the marketing content provider based on a cost per click as disclosed by Applicant. By Applicant's own admission, the feature of charging a fee from the provider of the marketing content based on a cost per click is admitted prior art.

As per **Claims 8, 16, and 24**, Ricci fails to disclose a method of charging a fee from the provider of the marketing content based on a cost per acquisition. However, Applicant discloses that this feature is old and well known, see Specification, Page 11, lines 8-11. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the Ricci and include charging a fee from the marketing content provider based on a cost per acquisition as disclosed by Applicant. By Applicant's own admission, the feature of

charging a fee from the provider of the marketing content based on a cost per acquisition is admitted prior art.

As per **Claim 25**, Ricci fails to disclose a method for providing subscription-based decentralized file downloads to client nodes in a peer-to-peer public network, each of the client nodes affiliated with a user account, the method comprising the steps of:

- (b) allowing the client nodes to subscribe to one or more of the content files (0057, 0061);
- (c) periodically delivering the particular content files to the respective clients nodes that subscribed to the content files (0040);
- (f) charging the user accounts of the client nodes that received fee-based subscription content files (0022, 0053).

Nonetheless, Ricci fails to disclose:

- (a) receiving content files from at least one content provider, the content including free subscription content files, fee-based subscription content files, and marketing content files;
- (d) charging the content provider a fee for delivering the content files to the client nodes over the network.

However, Ferguson et al. teaches receiving content files from content providers; and also charging content providers a fee for serving the content files to the users (C. 4, lines 53-60). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the method of Ricci and include receiving content files from content

providers and charging content providers a fee for serving the files as taught by Ferguson et al. because charging a variety of content providers a fee would greatly increase profitability of the file sharing service. Ricci and Ferguson et al. nonetheless fail to disclose charging the content provider a fee for the marketing content files based on a number of users that access the marketing content files once downloaded. However, Applicant discloses that this feature is old and well known, see Specification, Page 11, lines 8-11. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify the Ricci and include charging content provider a fee based on the number of users to access the content as disclosed by Applicant. By Applicant's own admission, the feature of charging a fee from the provider of the marketing content based on a cost per acquisition is admitted prior art.

Double Patenting

10. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington,* 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

11. Claims **1-27** are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims **16 and 17** of copending Application No. 09/814319 in view of Ferguson et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,819,092.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. Claims **16 and 17** of Application No. 09/814319 recite:

A peer-to-peer file delivery network, comprising:

- at least one server node;
- multiple client nodes coupled to the server node over the network, each of the client nodes running a client application, wherein the client application works and operates in conjunction with the server node to enable secure and reliable peer-to-peer file sharing between two client nodes by,

enable secure and reliable peer-to-peer file sharing between two client nodes by,

- generating account information for a user of each client node, including a digital certificate, in response to a registration process, wherein the digital certificate includes a private key and a public key,
- in response to a file being selected for publication on a first client node by a first user,

- generating and associating a digital fingerprint with the file,

- generating a bitstream ID for the file and including the bitstream ID in the fingerprint, and

- using the user's private key to generate a digital signature from the

file and including the digital signature in the fingerprint.

adding an entry for the file to a search list of shared files on the server

- node and storing the fingerprint on the server,

- in response to a second client node selecting the file from the search list on the server node, automatically transferring the file from the first client node directly to the second client node, and

- authenticating the file by the second client node by generating a new bitstream ID, comparing the new bitstream ID to the bitstream ID in the fingerprint stored on the server, and using the user's public key to decrypt the digital signature to determine the authenticity and reliability of the file and publisher.

The network of claim **17** wherein the client application operates in conjunction with the server node to enable subscription-based decentralized file downloads to the client nodes by

- allowing the client nodes to subscribe with the server node to periodically receive copies of one of the files,
- when providing a current subscribing client node with the file, locating the closest client node containing the file, and
- transferring the file from the closest node directly to the current subscribing node, thereby efficiently utilizing bandwidth.

Claims **16 and 17** of Application No. 09/814319 differs since it further recites additional claim limitations including generating account information for a user of each client node, including a digital certificate; authenticating the file by the second client node by generating a new bitstream

ID; and allowing client nodes to subscribe with the server node to periodically receive copies of one of the files. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify claims **16 and 17** of Application No. 09/814319 by removing the limitations directed to generating account information, authenticating a file using a bitstream, and allowing client nodes to subscribe with the server node resulting generally in the claims of the present application since the claims of the present application and the claims recited in Application No. 09/814319 actually perform a similar function. It is well established that the omission of an element and its function is an obvious expedient if the remaining elements perform the same function as before.

Also, claims **16 and 17** of Application No. 09/814319 differ since they fail to recite a method for charging a fee to providers and users of the subscription-based content, either for serving the subscription-based content to the users or for receiving the content. Ferguson et al. teaches a method for levying fees against both users and content providers in an online system (C. 4, lines 53-67). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to modify claims **16 and 17** of Application No. 09/814319 and include the method of charging a fee to providers and users of the subscription-based content as taught by Ferguson et al. because charging users and content providers a fee would greatly increase profitability for the service.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested that the applicant, in preparing the responses, fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FADEY S. JABR whose telephone number is (571)272-1516. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. - Fri. 8:00am to 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Hayes can be reached on (571) 272-6708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Fadey S Jabr
Examiner
Art Unit 3628

FSJ

Please address mail to be delivered by the United States Postal Service (USPS) as follows:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(571) 273-1516 [Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Customer Service Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314

/F. S. J./
Examiner, Art Unit 3628

/JOHN W HAYES/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3628